REMARKS

The present remarks are in response to the Office Action dated October 24, 2007, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-16, and 21-24. The Examiner rejected claims 21-24 under a second paragraph 112 rejection for being indefinite and failing to point out and distinctly claim the invention. Additionally, claims 1, 3-16, and 21-24 are rejected on 103(a) grounds as being obvious.

Although the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's grounds for rejection, the Applicant has amended the independent claims to expedite the prosecution of this patent application. The Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 11 to include new limitations and cancelled claims 21-24. Furthermore, new dependent claims 25-28 have been included in this Response. In view of the newly added claim limitations, the Applicant requests the Examiner place all claims detailed in the application in a state of allowance. No new matter has been added.

A.   35 USC Section 112

The Examiner rejected claims 21-24 under a second paragraph 112 rejection for being indefinite and failing to point out and distinctly claim the invention. Although the Applicant disagrees, for the sake of brevity the Applicant has cancelled the claims in question and more distinctly claimed the invention in the amended independent claims.

B.   Obviousness Rejection (35 USC Section 103(a))

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over by Chesley et al., (U.S. Patent 7,065,553) hereinafter "Chesley"

and in view of Gudorf et al., (U.S. Patent 7,140,045) hereinafter "Gudorf." Although the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the grounds for rejection, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 11 to overcome the rejection and has added new claims 25-28.

The Examiner's Action states that regarding claim 1 and 11, Chesley discloses all the elements of the claimed invention, except downloading Java applet into a web browser. The Examiner contends that Gudorf describes a Java applet that is downloaded to the web browser. Although the Applicant disagrees, the Applicant has amended the claims to expedite the prosecution of this patent application.

More particularly, claim 1 and 11 have been amended to include *inter alia*, compiling a script into a compact byte-code representation optimized for low bandwidth clients that is inserted into the text of a webpage enabling low bandwidth clients to interact with the immersive virtual world, and enabling an interface engine corresponding to each client to interpret the byte-code representation. Support for these claim amendments are provided *inter alia* in Paragraphs 0011, 0044 and 0045 of Applicant's Published Patent Application.

Applicant respectfully submits that Chesley and Gudorf fail to teach *inter alia* compiling a script into a compact byte-code representation optimized for low bandwidth clients that is inserted into the text of a webpage enabling low bandwidth clients to interact with the immersive virtual world, and enabling an interface engine corresponding to each client to interpret the byte-code representation.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that the implementation claimed by the Applicant would not suggest themselves to someone of ordinary skill in the art

because Applicant's claimed implementation is directed to enabling and supporting low bandwidth connections.

The Examiner's Action referred to Chesley at col. 20: line 50 – col. 21: Line 57 for the proposition that Chesley teaches the use of interactive Java tools. See Page 4 of Examiner's Action. In summary, Chesley describes the "ability of an object to sense the change in other objects that produce various types of data ... in the VWE." Thus, although Chesley teaches interactivity, Chesley fails to a solution that supports a low bandwidth connection as claimed by Applicant.

Additionally, the Examiner referred to col. 14: lines 50 – 55 and col. 16: lines 39-52 for the proposition that Chesley teaches an interface engine residing in a Java environment. In col. 14, Chesley makes a singular reference to Java and then continues to describe a DHTML implementation that does NOT describe supporting low bandwidth connections by compiling a script into a compact byte-code representation that is inserted into the text of a webpage, and enabling an interface engine corresponding to each client to interpret the byte-code representation. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the resulting interface engine is relatively small because each client interprets the byte-code representation and thus supports low bandwidth connections.

With respect to Gudorf at col. 3: lines 5-27, the description focuses on using Java applets for security purposes, namely, a "verification program 100," "maintaining the integrity of data," "prevents ... unauthorized ... changes to the data," "enables the verification program 100 to protect the sensitive data it contains, such as credit card information." Thus, the use of Java applets is directed to preserving the confidentiality of credit card information and not to enabling and/or

supporting low bandwidth connections. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Gudorf teaches away from Applicant's claims.

Additionally, Applicant's new claims include limitations directed to enabling <u>a filtering tool to filter a list of blacklisted words and generating a log containing the blacklisted words.</u> Support for these limitations is provided in *inter alia* in Paragraphs 0058 – 0060 of the Applicant's Published Patent Application. In summary, no such limitation is taught in Chesley or Gudorf or suggested by Chesley or Gudorf.

Finally, the remaining dependent claims depend from currently amended claim 1 and 11. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the dependent claims is in a condition for allowance.

C.   Conclusion

In view of all of the foregoing, claims 1, 3 – 16, and 25-28 overcome the prior

art rejections and are now patentably distinct and in condition for allowance, which

action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted

Dated: 1/24/08

Michael A. Kerr
Reg. No. 42,722

Michael A. Kerr
VIRTUAL LEGAL, LLC
P.O. Box 22028
Carson City, NV 89721

Tel: (775) 841-3388
Fax: (775) 841-3389